

**NOVA Steering Committee Meeting
Tacoma Ramada Inn
June 11, 2003**

The NOVA Steering Committee convened at the Tacoma Ramada Inn at 2:00 p.m. on June 11, 2003. Those present were: Greg Lovelady, Scott Chapman, James Horan, Bob Boone, Carol Jensen, Lee Fouts, Dave Bowers, Karl Forsgaard, Art Tuftee, Lonnie Landrie, Pene Speaks, Nina Carter, Vladimir Steblina, and Lisa Anderson. Dee Endelman facilitated the meeting and Eli Asher took notes.

Dee Endelman reviewed the agenda (Attachment 1) and explained the process by which it was developed. She briefly described the purpose and desired outcomes of the meeting:

Purpose: To recommend make up and selection process of the permanent NOVA Advisory Committee.

Desired Outcomes Today:

- Understanding of our task
- Selection criteria for NOVA Advisory Committee Members
- Agreement on committee composition
- Selection process for committee members

After a round of introductions, Dee reviewed the suggested ground rules for the meeting:

- Start and end on time.
- Cell phones/beepers off or set to “buzz”.
- All ideas are okay to express.
- Participation is important.
- Use airtime appropriately (don’t withhold or dominate).
- Express ideas with honesty and respect.
- Work at understanding each other.
- Focus on common ground whenever possible.
- Encourage humor (tasteful, of course!)

Dee introduced the idea of interests vs. positions:

An interest is a powerful motivator- a need, fear, or concern that drives you regarding particular issue.

A position, on the other hand, is your favorite solution to the issue.

Dee distributed a sheet outlining a “thumbs up/thumbs down” tool for Group Decision Making. This tool will be used to check opinions on various options that the group may develop over the course of the meeting (Attachment 2).

Dee outlined the immediate tasks of this committee, as well as future tasks of the permanent committee once its members are selected:

This Steering Committee's Task

June: Develop recommendations for

- Committee makeup
- Selection process
 - June 23 goal, June 30 deadline

July: Recommendations go to IAC Board (IAC Board meets July 10 and 11)

- Selection of NOVA Advisory committee members

NOVA Advisory Committee's Tasks

August: Committee begins

December: Recommendations complete

January-March: Review first round of grant applications

The group discussed and clarified the timeline for the two committees.

Structure of prior committee:

For clarification on past function, the group reviewed the structure of the prior NOVA Advisory Committee: one State government representative (historically from DNR), one Federal representative (historically from USFS), one local government representative (traditionally from County law enforcement or ORV parks management), 3 motorized vehicle recreation representatives (4-wheel drive, motorcycle, and ATV), 3 non-motorized recreation representatives (hiking, equestrian, and mountain biking).

The group discussed the reasons behind changing the makeup of the committee. The Fuel Use Study and HB 1698 are the primary drivers behind the change. Greg Lovelady distributed a diagram of the new committee envisioned by HB 1698 and explained the legislation, including the difference between the NOVA Committee and the "expanded" NOVA Committee. The "expanded" NOVA Committee's mission is to make recommendations to the legislature for changes in the RCW related to NOVA. The "expanded" Committee will include:

- Four appointed legislators
- Three state agencies (WDNR, WDFW, WSP)
- Recreational Land Managers
- County sheriffs
- NOVA Committee - Members representing recreational interests proportionate to their representation in the Fuel Use Study.

Given the number of appointed representatives on the expanded Committee (9, HB 1698, Sec. 2), the group decided that their task was to agree on representation for about 7 additional members (HB 1698, Sec. 1), in order to keep the expanded committee to a reasonable number.

The group engaged in an historical discussion, talking about various viewpoints about the fairness and efficacy of the NOVA structure in the past. Then the group turned its discussion towards the future.

Important attributes for prospective committee members:

In order to develop selection criteria for new committee members, the group discussed and suggested the following desirable attributes in a candidate. To check consensus on the importance of each criterion, Dee used the “thumbs up/thumbs down” survey. Following are the attributes to which all agreed:

- Knowledgeable/experienced in the interests s/he represents
- Willing to work for win/win
- Appreciates and understands a variety of recreational interests
- Interested and/or concerned with policy-level issues
- Available
- Wants to be on committee
- Willing to listen (willing to work toward understanding)
- People who speak their own opinion, not “party lines”
- People who work for greater good of the program- not operate from a narrow point of view
- Demonstrated ability to be creative in problem solving.
- Diversity- geographic, gender, physical ability, etc.

The group also discussed an invitation to tribes, as well as the possibility of IAC paying a per diem to cover travel expenses for Committee members

Proportionality:

The group discussed some interpretations of the proportionality clause in HB 1698. One member suggested that the 7 or so recreational user members could be included using one of two methods:

1. One could interpret “proportionality” as having a rough representation on the committee of the percentages of recreational population (based on “gallonage” fuel use):
 - 20% ORV (4-wheelers, ATV, motorcycle, including “to and from” fuel use, as well as in-activity fuel use)
 - 30% non-motorized trail users (snowshoeing, mountain biking, hiking)
 - 50% “other” (berry picking, mushroom hunting, camping, fishing, wildlife viewing, etc.)

2. Another interpretation could be based on percentage of various recreational users (regardless of “gallonage”):

- Hikers 27%
- ORV 12%
- Cross Country Skiing 8%
- Mountain Biking 7%
- Snowmobiling 2%
- Hunting 8%
- Equestrian 4%
- “Other” approximately 36%

Another group member suggested that the agencies in the expanded committee could represent certain recreational users (e.g., those in the “other” category).

Proposed models for make up of the permanent NOVA Committee:

The group discussed several methods for achieving proportionality. The idea of balancing “votes” was discussed, as was the option of dividing the expanded committee into proportional groups. Throughout, IAC staff and the facilitator reminded the group that the model for the expanded committee would be collaborative so that “votes” were not likely to be critical to its success. One member explained that regardless of terminology, proportionality of user group representation has a profound effect on the group dynamic and on the group’s allocation of funds to types of recreation that are more consumptive and more impactful to everyone’s natural resources, versus those that have less impact on nature.

The following models were suggested and discussed by the group:

3 motorized representatives

3 non-motorized representatives

4 agency representatives that would represent the rest of the “other” contingency

2 ORV

4 non-motorized (2 hikers, 1 biker, 1 equestrian)

3 or 4 “other” (fish/hunt, wildlife viewing, gathering)

3 ORV (4-wheel, motorcycle, ATV)

3 non-motorized (hikers, bikers, horses)

3 other (fish/hunt, wildlife viewing, gathering)

2 ORV

2 non-motorized

3 other

2 ORV

3 non-motorized

5 other

3 ORV

2 hiking

1 Mountain bike

1 equestrian

3 other

2 ORV

3 non-motorized

5 other ("at large" recreational users: this selection would rely on Laura's discretion)

The group narrowed the discussion to the following three models:

2 ORV

3 non-motorized

5 other ("at large" recreational users: this selection would rely on Laura's discretion)

3 ORV (4-wheel, motorcycle, ATV)

3 non-motorized (hikers, bikers, horses)

3 other (fish/hunt, wildlife viewing, gathering)

2 ORV

2 non-motorized

3 other

The group discussed the merits of each of the models for some time. Since the time remaining for the meeting was rapidly dwindling, Dee called a halt to discussion to take a check on opinions in the room on proposed plans. No plan had group consensus. It was noted that achieving the legislatively required proportionality could be assisted in part by IAC's selection of appropriate reps in the "other" category. After additional intensive discussion, the group achieved consensus that the following "3,3,3" proportioned NOVA Committee could be lived with:

3 ORV representatives

3 non-motorized trail user representatives (including 2 hikers and 1 mountain biker)

3 other (including 1 equestrian)

The meeting adjourned at 6:15